



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

#### XIV.—LITURGICAL INFLUENCE IN *THE DREAM OF THE ROOD*

Scholars have long made an earnest search for analogues to *The Dream of the Rood*, but the very remoteness of the parallels thus afforded so far is a unique testimony to the high degree of originality in the poem. Closer in some ways than any of them, in that it gives us a dialogue with the cross, the “Disputation between Mary and the Cross” might have been cited; but here again comparison shows that the *Dream* is a poem standing apart in the unusually fine quality of its inspiration and in its genuine feeling. The poet seems to have had little to work on for a basis, either as a source or as a guide. Yet we know that he was deeply religious and we can be sure that he must have been thoroughly acquainted with those parts of the ecclesiastical service which were devoted to the celebration of the cross. In writing such a poem he could hardly rid his mind of all the echoes of the hymns and responsive utterances and the liturgical offices which he was accustomed to hear at various times during the church year.

No hymn or piece of liturgy seems to have furnished him a model, and nothing could be more different in spirit and manner than his work and the type of hymn probably accessible to him.<sup>1</sup> The poet writes primarily as a narrator; subjective expression in the form of complaint or panegyric comes in only incidentally, although perhaps all the more spontaneously. But he naturally would express

<sup>1</sup> It is worth while to compare the poem with such hymns as those of the West Gothic type, which celebrate Constantine and Helen, and which refer to the *tenebrae* and the harrowing of hell: see Dreves, *Anal. Hymn.*, xxvii, pp. 90 ff.

himself in the idiom of the church. And it is the purpose of this study to trace such resemblances as may be found and to detect allusions which seem to have been deliberate, in order to gain a further knowledge of the poet's working method and to assist in reproducing a sense of the connotativeness of the poem. Its meaning for contemporary readers or hearers will thus be shown deepened; we may arrive at some conclusions regarding its relation to certain other Anglo-Saxon treatments of parts of the theme; and our conclusions may have some bearing on the general problem of the attribution of the poem.

What were the liturgical forms familiar to the poet? We may safely conjecture the general outlines from those of a somewhat later period. In regard to the hymns the difficulty is greater because presumably the hymns follow no traditional scheme. Yet even here, beautiful as the hymns are, the phrases in speech and figure are often stereotyped formulae which were freely passed around; and by reviewing the common stock of a later time we can assume with fair safety that the figures were known in some earlier form. Wholesale borrowing from an early favorite is one of the most striking features in the growth of hymnology. And if the *Dream of the Rood* shows a use of the phrase or formula turning up generally elsewhere, it seems extremely likely that the Anglo-Saxon poet was the debtor. I shall attempt to point out all such borrowings, and in doing so I shall include many slighter reminiscences or casual parallels which I should not mention in a strict category. Since the chief point consists in the number of the parallels, so far as the hymns are concerned, I shall put them in the body of the discussion rather than in the footnotes.

þuhte me þæt ic gesawe syllcre treow  
 on lyft lædan leohte bewunden,  
 beama beorhtost. Eall þæt beacen wæs  
 begoten mid golde; gimmas stodon. *DR*, ll. 4-6.

As scholars have noted before,<sup>2</sup> these lines afford a tantalizing parallel to some similar lines in the *Elene*, which I shall quote, together with the Latin of the *Acta Sanct.*, to see whether any conclusions may be reached in regard to the resemblance.

Geseah he frætwum beorht  
 wlitig wuldres treo ofer wolena  
 hrof  
 golde geglenged: gimmas lixtan.  
 wæs se blaca beam bocstafum  
 awriten  
 beorhte and leohte. *Elene*, ll. 88-92.

Intendens in caelum vidit signum  
 crucis Christi ex lumine claro  
 constitutum, et desuper litteris  
 aureis scriptum titulum.<sup>3</sup>

Holth., *Elene*, p. 4, § 85.

The parallel to the *Elene* at first seems remarkable and among the points of similarity may be noted the following: "ic gesawe" (geseah he); "syllcre treow" (wuldres treo); "beama beorhtost" (se blaca beam); "begoten mid golde" (golde geglenged); "gimmas" (gimmas). Yet there are certain points in which the *Dream* is closer to the Latin: "on lyft" (in caelum); "leohte bewunden" (ex lumine claro constitutum); the use of "beacen" (signum). And some of the ways in which it resembles the *Elene* fade in importance when more care-

<sup>2</sup> Cook notes the parallel here with the *Elene* and also with the *Daniel*, ll. 496 ff.—*The Dream of the Rood*, Oxford, 1905, p. 11, p. xlvi. See also Sarrazin in the discussion of ll. 7-9 below.

<sup>3</sup> The Anglo-Saxon prose (*EETS*, XLVI, p. 3) reads: "He ða sona beseah up on þære heofenan. Þær geseah þat halwænde tacen Christes rode on myceles liohetes brihtnesse ongean him geset." The Irish (Schirmer, *Leabhar Breac*, St. Gallen, 1886, p. 32, l. 60): "Sah er das Zeichen und die Gestalt des Kreuzes Christi am Himmel oben und einen sehr grossen, unerträglichen Glanz darum auf jeder Seite."

fully examined. "Ic gesawe" is necessary in the *Dream* as part of the obvious schematism (see also ll. 21, 33, 51, pointed out by Cook in his edition, p. 17, n. 14<sup>b</sup>.) The use of "treow" is natural in either case as an epithet for the cross, since it is the usual gloss for *lignum* and *arbor* of the hymns.<sup>4</sup>

The use of "beama" here may have more significance. But we may note that it is also to be found in a similar passage in the *Riddles*:

Ic seah on bearwe beam hlifian  
tanum torhtne. *Rid.*, 54, ll. 1 ff.

One may add *Rid.*, 56, l. 7; and *Crist* (Part III), l. 1089.

It may be objected that "beacen" of the *Dream* cited as a parallel to *signum* in the Latin is also found in the *Elene*, l. 100: "Swa he þæt beacen geseah." But there it is the equivalent of some form of "viso autem signo" and has nothing to do with the lines I have quoted. It is necessary to add that "beacen" is not much evidence either way, since as "signum" it is common enough in the hymns: Mone, I, p. 174, l. 7 (Crux insignis palmae signum); Daniel, IV, p. 276, l. 9 (Crux est signum, quod est dignum); IV, p. 185 and Mone, I, p. 145 (signum salutis); Daniel V, p. 183 (triumphale signum); Dreves, IX, p. 26, No. 25, 1a (signum Christi triumphale); XXXIX, p. 21, No. 9, 4a (signum triumphale); XLVIII, p. 57, No. 58 (venerabile signum).<sup>5</sup> Most striking of all is the appearance in the

<sup>a</sup>See Cook, p. 12; Wueleker's *Vocab.*, "iheawen treow"; *Lat. Hymns of the A. S. Church*, Surtees Soc., XXIII, 1851, p. 78, ll. 16-17.

<sup>b</sup>*Signum* is sometimes glossed "taen": see *Elene*, l. 85; prose, EETS, XLVI, p. 3; Napier, *O. E. Glosses*. The collections of hymns referred to in the course of the study are as follows: Mone, *lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1853; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*; Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica*; Chevalier, *Poésie Lit. du Moyen Age*, Paris, 1893; Merrill, *Latin Hymns*, N. Y., 1917; Morel,

liturgical phrase: "Hoc signum crucis erit in caelo."<sup>6</sup> This phrase is an almost sufficient explanation for the entire passage in the *Dream* and with this in mind there is hardly any need to call on Constantine's vision. The way it could be expanded may be suggested by the use of the same idea in the Irish *Altus Prosator*: "Xristo de celis domino descendente celissimo profulgebit clarissimum signum crucis et vexillum."<sup>7</sup>

My conclusions regarding the similarity to the *Elene*, then, are these: the episode in the *Dream* may possibly be based on one having nothing to do with the story of the *Inventio*; the verbal parallels may be due to the general similarity in situation (we have already seen the parallels in the *Riddles* and I shall refer to *Daniel*, ll. 496 ff. later); in at least two expressions the *Dream* is closer to the Latin. The detail of gold and gems in both the *Dream* and the *Elene* is certainly of the highest importance, but I shall reserve that for special study. If anything can be deduced at present it is that if the *Dream* alludes to the episode in the *Inventio*, it went straight to some source approximating the Latin, while the *Elene* utilized both the *Dream* and the *Inventio* story. What version of the *Inventio* may have

*Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, N. Y., 1868; Chevalier, *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, Louvain, 1912; *The Latin Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Surtees Soc., xxiii, 1851; Bernard and Atkinson, *Liber Hymnorum*, *HBS*; Prudentius, ed. Weitzius, Hanoviae, 1613.

<sup>6</sup> *Hereford Brev.*, *HBS*, II, pp. 159, 160; *York Brev.*, Surtees Soc., LXXV, II, col. 270, col. 554; *Colbertine Brev.*, *HBS*, II, pp. 313, 315; *Brev. Sarum*, Proctor and Wordsworth, Cambridge, 1886, III, col. 276; Wordsworth, *Ceremonies and Proc. of the Cath. Ch. of Salisbury*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 95. See also the Blickling Homily for Easter, Morris, *EETS*, p. 91, ll. 23. Cf. Cook, p. xlvi, drawing attention to the presence of the "heavenly host."

<sup>7</sup> *Liber Hymnorum*, *HBS*, I, p. 80, ll. 122; for the tradition see II, pp. 166 ff.

been known to the poet of the *Dream* it is, of course, impossible to say;<sup>8</sup> but he may have found his source in some form used in the *lectio* for the feast of the *Inventio*. For instance, in the York Breviary (Surtees Soc., II, col. 272, *lectio ij*) we have: "Et intuens in celum: vidit signum crucis Christi."<sup>9</sup> In a different version the shining of the cross may have been added, which is a regular detail in Constantine's vision.<sup>10</sup>

Begoten mid golde; gimmas stodon  
fægere æt foldan sœatum, swylice þær fife wæron  
uppe on þam eaxlgespanne. DR, ll. 7-9.

On this passage Serrazin bases his argument for the intimate connection with the *Elene*: "Dass aber Constantinus, nach K's Darstellung das Kreuz schon in der kostbaren Verzierung gesehen haben soll, welche ihm erst nach der Auffindung zuteil wurde, ist ein offensichtlicher Anachronismus, der sich nur dadurch erklärt, dass dem Dichter das visionäre Kreuz Constantins so vor dem geistigen Auge schwebte, wie es dem Traumseher erschienen war."<sup>11</sup> Ebert's comment in another connection but on the same general idea is applicable here—that such a conclusion assumes that the poet of the *Dream* or of the *Elene* could see no other passage on the subject and no example of such a cross other than the one first described.<sup>12</sup>

The chief problem is whether there were such crosses in England at the time in question. Ebert cites two allusions,

<sup>8</sup> One may note the close parallel between "leichte bewunden" and the Irish "einen sehr grossen, unerträglichen Glanz auf jeder Seite."

<sup>9</sup> See also *Colbertine Brev.*, II, p. 315.

<sup>10</sup> See Holder, *Invent. Crucis*, p. 40, l. 6, "Enituit"; the Syrian "den grossen und herrlichen Lichtschein des Heiligen Kreuzes," ASNS, XCIII, p. 9; Mone, I, p. 134, st. 25.

<sup>11</sup> Von Kädmon bis Kynewulf, Berlin, 1913, p. 121.

<sup>12</sup> Berichte der Königl. Sächs. Ges. der Wiss., Leipzig, 1881, p. 84, n. 4.

both of which are however somewhat inferential: the *Ded. S. Crucis* of the *Pontificale* of the Archbishop of York—here “in splendore cristalli” may well refer to the “crux de christallo,” carried in the English Church in Eastertide until Ascension Day, which after all may not have been a jewelled cross;<sup>13</sup> in Tatwine’s *Riddle* the word “nitescere” may describe the shining beryl or merely the light of a gold cross.<sup>14</sup> Supporting evidence is derived from Ebert’s examples of gemmed crosses of the time,<sup>15</sup> but it must be said that the force of the total argument is slight compared with what we should have. If we are to believe that the poet actually saw such a cross, would he not have been so much impressed by such a rarity as to have devoted much more of his description, indeed the whole poem, to its details? Would not a *crux gemmata* have seemed a rarity in England in the eighth or ninth centuries, as we might infer from the material so far adduced?

It seems well worth while to collect the evidence to show that there were many such crosses in the British Isles and that the poet did not need to depend on a vision for the details. Precious stones, possibly jewels, were used in ornamenting the early churches; most interestingly for us in the Priory at Hexham:<sup>16</sup>

Porro beatae memoriae, adhuc vivens gratia Dei, Acca episcopus,  
qui magnalia ornamenta hujus multiplicis domus de auro et argento,

---

<sup>13</sup> See Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, London, 1905, iv, p. 290, and 1, p. 240; Wordsworth, *The Tracts of Clement Maydeston*, HBS, London, 1894, p. 53; J. D. Chalmers, *Divine Worship in England in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, London, 1877, p. 13; Feasey, *Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial*, London, 1897, pp. 241-2.

<sup>14</sup> Cook, *DR*, p. 19, considers Ebert’s evidence not “quite convincing.”

<sup>15</sup> Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*, Paris, 1877, p. 216; Zoeckler, *Das Kreuz Christi*, pp. 206 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Surtees Soc., XLIV, 1864, I, App. v.

lapidibusque pretiosis et quomodo altaria purpura et serico induita decoravit, quis ad explanandum sufficere potest.<sup>17</sup>

Pope Gregory sent the famous cross of Columcille to Iona as early as 590.<sup>18</sup> We may note that the jewelled cross was common in Europe in the early period: still extant are those in the mosaics in Italy, dating from the fourth to the eighth century. They are plain Roman or slightly pattée, and both the crossbeam and the upright are jewelled. Some of them have specifically five jewels on the crossbeam: that in S. Apollinare in Classe in Ravenna;<sup>19</sup> that in the catacomb of Pontianus;<sup>20</sup> and that in S. Giov. Laterano in Rome.<sup>21</sup> The number varies, however, in

<sup>17</sup> See the jewel-adorned church of the apostate Irish priest, *Revue Celt.*, xx, p. 428.

<sup>18</sup> *Liber Hymn.*, I, p. 63, l. 36; II, p. 24. The cross was called "the great gem." Compare the figure "quam preciosa gemma," *Brev. Sarum*, III, col. 273; and "thesaurus perfectorum," Merrill, *Lat. Hymns*, p. 67. See also Prudentius:

Agnoscas, Regina, libens mea signa necesse est,  
In quibus effigies Crucis aut gemmata refulget,

(*Contra Symm.*, p. 274, ll. 465.) See the cross of St. Margaret, Hewison, *Runic Roods*, Glasgow, 1914, p. 7; also *Opera Symeonis Dun.*, Surtees Soc., 1868, I, p. 239; cf. Brandl, *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.*, 1905, p. 722. Note the use of jewels on the Pastoral Staff of St. Patrick in the seventh century: F. E. Warren, *The Lit. and Rit. of the Celtic Church*, Oxford, 1881, p. 115.

<sup>19</sup> For the books on the mosaics I am indebted to the kindness of Professor G. G. King of Bryn Mawr for pointing out many useful references. The generosity of the libraries of Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Pennsylvania, has helped me at every turn in the bibliography of this paper. For S. Apollinare in Classe, see Diehl, *Ravenne*, Paris, 1907, p. 71; date, pp. 24, 62. Less accurately, Didron, *Christ, Icon.*, trans. Stokes, Bohn ed., I, pp. 396 ff. Inaccurately, Twining, *Symbols and Emblems*, London, 1852, plate vi, fig. ix.

<sup>20</sup> Lowrie, *Monuments of the Early Church*, N. Y., 1916, p. 244, fig. 83; Twining, pl. vi, fig. 11, opp. p. 14.

<sup>21</sup> Bunsen, *Basiliken des christlichen Roms*, pl. 46; Twining, pl. xxxvi, fig. 8, also pl. vii, fig. 9.

other crosses of this type: for example, that in the apse of S. Pudenziana;<sup>22</sup> that in S. Paolo fuori le mura;<sup>23</sup> and that in the apse of S. Teodoro.<sup>24</sup> The evidence shows that this cross was widely popular. It came from a Byzantine source, apparently, and spread over Europe, not merely in the form of mosaics but in other decorative forms.<sup>25</sup> And with the Oriental influence so powerful in Celtic and early English Christianity, it seems more than likely that it penetrated to the British Isles. The form appears in the plain English altar cross,<sup>26</sup> and the jewelled type is reproduced in the well-known Cross of Cong.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Kraus, *Gesch. der christl. Kunst*, Freiburg, 1896, frontispiece 1; Lowrie, p. 306.

<sup>23</sup> Kraus, 1, p. 182, fig. 144; Lowrie, p. 311. See Kraus, 1, p. 324; Lowrie, p. 311; Bunsen, *Basiliken*, pl. XLV.

<sup>24</sup> C. R. Morey, *Lost Mosaics and Frescoes of Rome of the Med. Period*, Princeton, 1915, p. 26. See also the fresco, p. 62, pl. v; and see Twining, pl. LVI; p. 36, pl. XVII; p. 38, pl. XVIII; pl. LXXXIX. Also *Asturias y Léon* by D. José M. Quadrado, Barcelona, 1885, pl. opp. p. 88 (9th cent.); Tavenor-Perry, *Dinanderie*, London, 1910, pl. XVII; Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét. et de Liturgie*, Paris, 1914, III<sup>2</sup>, 3104, fig. 3403, 3411, pl. opp. 3107. Certainly many other examples could be collected with little trouble.

<sup>25</sup> For the Byzantine influence see: Diehl, *Ravenne*, pp. 63 ff.; Schnaase, *Gesch. der bildenden Kunst*, III (Im Mittelalter, 1), Düsseldorf, 1869, pp. 217 ff.; J. R. Allen, *Early Chr. Symb. in Gt. Br. and Ireland*, London, 1887, p. 142; compare Hewison, *Runic Roods*, pp. 3, 132; see the ornament of the Lindisfarne Gospels, *Repro. from Illum. MSS.*, British Museum, Series III, 1908, p. 9; G. B. Brown, *The Arts in Early England*, III, plate x, 2, 3, 4, 6. See the Gothic crosses, Lacroix, *Les Arts au Moy. Age*, p. 128; pl. opp. p. 130, a, b, d, e; p. 131, fig. 88; p. 132; p. 141, fig. 95. See also Dennison and Morey, *Studies in East Christian and Roman Art*, N. Y., 1918, pl. xxxiii, fig. 2.

<sup>26</sup> *Repro. from Illum. MSS.*, series II, 1907, pl. vi; and Allen, *Early Chr. Symb.*, pp. 253 ff., 261 (fig. 90), 262 (91), 278 (99), 282 (101).

<sup>27</sup> Armstrong, *Art in Gt. Br. and Ireland*, N. Y., 1909, p. 12, fig. 17, gives a generally accessible picture of it. See Coffey, *Guide to R. Irish Acad. Coll.*, Dublin, 1910, p. 56, dating it c. 1123 A. D. Cf. the cross in S. Giov. Lat. to which I have referred.

But what evidence we have indicates that this particular form arrived later than the period with which we are concerned. And even if it were known earlier, one might well question why, if this was the cross the poet had in mind, he laid so much emphasis on the five jewels of the cross-beam and neglected the greater number on the upright. Furthermore, there is no reason for supposing that the number on the crossbeam was likely to have been just five.

But another type of cross was familiar in England at the very time when the poem was probably composed, and it affords a more satisfactory explanation of the passage. I refer to the Celtic cross, which may be most readily recalled in the forms in stone: the arms of equal length and pattée, usually placed in a circle.<sup>28</sup> Sometimes in each angle is a dot or small cross, making—with the circle or boss at the center—five units of ornamentation.<sup>29</sup> This last characteristic is extremely common in the Celtic cross of English and Scottish territory.<sup>30</sup> In the stone representations it will be found that whatever the variation in the arrangement of the dots, crosses, or bosses, importance seems to be attached to the number five.

<sup>28</sup> See Armstrong, *Art in Gt. Br. and Ireland*, p. 7, fig. 8, for the type.

<sup>29</sup> Allen, *Early Chr. Symb.*, p. 100, fig. 14, 2, 3, 4, 5; p. 105, fig. 16, 4; p. 114, fig. 20, 1, 2.

<sup>30</sup> See G. B. Brown, *The Arts in Early Eng.*, N. Y., 1903, II, p. 211, fig. 127; Rev. W. S. Calverley, *Early Sculptured Stones in the Diocese of Carlisle*, Kendal, 1899, pp. 3, 78, 139, 170, 223. Note the variations with bosses at the end of each beam, p. 8; boss at the end of each beam and one in the center, pp. 34, 223, 263; five bosses in circle in the center, p. 206. See Allen, *Brit. Arch. Journ.*, XXXIV, p. 357; A. G. Langdon, *Old Cornish Crosses*, 1896, pp. 190, 358, 391. See also the English consecration crosses, *Archaeol.*, XLVIII, pl. xxxiii, fig. 7; pl. xxxvii, fig. 9, 10; XLVII, p. 161; XXV, p. 279. Note the fragments of a cross from the priory of Hexham: Surtees Soc., *The Priory of Hexham*, II, 1865, p. xxxi, no. 3.

The significance of these crosses for us may now be clear, and their importance will be greater if we can find any replicas of the type using precious stones. Fortunately there is good evidence that the same type was used in the jewelled cross; and this too maintains the quincunx, sometimes with the jewels in place of the dots or crosses and sometimes with a gem at the end of each beam. The form appears in the ornamentation of the box of St. Molaise;<sup>31</sup> and in the pectoral cross formerly considered the property of St. Cuthbert.<sup>32</sup> Here it is comprehensible what the poet means by the five jewels on the "eaxlgespan," since they would form the chief points of color and decoration. And here we have another link between a "Cynewulfian" poem and Celtic Christianity.

The general explanation of the use of the number five in the bosses has been the symbolism of the five wounds. Thus Stevens<sup>33</sup> and J. R. Allen<sup>34</sup> have held this view.

<sup>31</sup> *Archaeologia* XLIII, pt. 1, p. 149, pl. xxi. For this type see also the ms. illumination in Westwood's *Facsimiles of the Miniatures and Ornaments of A.-S. and Irish MSS.*, London, 1868, pl. vii, Gospel of Durrow; pl. XII, Lindisfarne Gospels.

<sup>32</sup> The attribution is opposed by Archbishop Eyre, *Hist. of St. Cuthbert*, London, 1887, pp. 218-219, 319. See also Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéol. Chrét.*, III (2), p. 3106, fig. 3406. See the similar cross on the altar of St. Ambrose presented by the Archbishop of Milan in 885: Leroux Agincourt, *Hist. of Art.*, II, xxvi, 2. See the cross, apparently taken from a ms. illumination, on the title page of the Aelfric Soc. ed. of the *Homilies of the A.-S. Church*, London, 1846. See the quincunx in an enamelled cross in the Hamilton broach, *A.-S. Review*, Dec. 1900, p. 170 (9th cent.). See the cross with one jewel at the center, *Archaeol.*, XLIV, p. opp. p. 48.; cf. also G. B. Brown, *The Arts in Early England*, III, plate A, 1; plate x, 7; IV, plates CIII, CXLV, CXLVII. For jewelled crosses of another type which appears in the stone: *Arch.*, I, pt. 2, p. 406, pl. XXIII, fig. 1; G. B. Brown, *op. cit.*, II, p. 31, fig. 17(a); Allen, *Early Chr. Symbolism*, p. 99.

<sup>33</sup> W. O. Stevens, *The Cross in the Life and Lit. of the A.-S.*, Yale Studies, p. 43.

<sup>34</sup> *Early Chr. Symbolism*, p. 100; *Brit. Archaeol. Journ.*, XXXIV, p. 357.

Bayley, engaged in propounding another thesis however, glances at it with hostility: "The five knobs or bosses erroneously supposed to represent the 'five wounds of Christ,' are of frequent occurrence."<sup>35</sup> For the jewels on the cross, Cook quotes another interpretation from the *Legenda Aurea*: "And in sign of these four virtues the four corners of the cross be adorned with precious gems and stones. And in the most apparent place is charity, and on the right side is obedience, and on the left side is patience, and beneath is humility, the root of all the virtues."<sup>36</sup> This suggestion is supported by the use of the same virtues in the ladder figure of the cross in Alanus de Insulis.<sup>37</sup> An Anglo-Saxon reading of the significance of such elements, although it does not touch on the number, gives a similar idea:

þurh þæt gold we understandað geleafan and god in gehygd; þurh þæt seolfor riht lice spræce and getingnysse on Godes lare; ðurh þa deorwurðan gymstanes halige mihte.<sup>38</sup>

The jewels, then, may have symbolized certain virtues.

On the other hand, Durandus tells us in the *Rationale*:<sup>39</sup> "Crux in medio altar significat passiones quam Christus in medio tre subdit."<sup>40</sup> We should expect the wounds to receive special attention since they are given so much emphasis in the hymns and the liturgy.<sup>41</sup> The

<sup>35</sup> *The Lost Lang. of Symbolism*, London, 1912, II, p. 129.

<sup>36</sup> *DR*, pp. 14 ff.

<sup>37</sup> Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, ccx, col. 224.

<sup>38</sup> Aelfric Soc., *Homilies*, London, 1846, I<sup>2</sup>, pp. 588-9. See also pp. 590-591.

<sup>39</sup> Ed. 1484, p. 10 v°.

<sup>40</sup> See also Honorius, Migne, CLXXII, col. 587: "Crux ob tres causas super altare erigitur . . . secundo ut passio Christi semper ecclesiae repraesentetur." See col. 559 and 560 (LVI) for interpretations of five.

<sup>41</sup> See Hoskins, *Primers of Sarum and York*, London and N. Y., 1901, pp. 123, 11, 112, 360; Dickinson, *Missale Sarum*, 1861-1883, col. 751 ff.

five crosses cut in the altar stones and the five signs of the cross are taken as similarly symbolical.<sup>42</sup> With these may be associated the five grains of incense in the liturgy, and the five stones in David's bag.<sup>43</sup> And if the symbolism was not a matter of some special study and opinion, but the laity in general was expected to know it and derive benefit from it, the evidence for a symbolism other than that of the five wounds would have to be pretty general. Five is not a steady number for the virtues, which are usually classified as four or seven. It seems fairly safe, therefore, to believe that in the *Dream* the poet mentions the five jewels not only because they were prominent in the actual cross that he knew, but because they represented the sacred wounds, an interpretation of some power.

At this point we may note that the *Elene*, though it mentions jewels, gives no specific number. Here again, then, if there is any relation between the two poems, the *Dream* is probably the earlier, or at least it is not indebted to the *Elene*.<sup>44</sup> Some difficulties remain in the lines of the *Dream*: the meaning of "fægere æt foldan sceatum" is not quite clear. Perhaps a hint may be found in the passage of the *Daniel* (ll. 500-501):<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, I, pp. 74 ff.; I, p. 192. He gives a review of the patristic utterances on the subject.

<sup>43</sup> *Blickl. Hom.*, EETS, LVIII, p. 31, ll. 16. Note the representation of the five wounds in Twining's *Symbols and Emblems*, p. 40, pl. xix, fig. 6; see the five jewels in the diadem of God, *ibid.*, pl. XXXIV, p. 70, fig. 3; and the five wounds painted on the red cross of a cross-cloth, Feasey, *Ancient Eng. Holy Week Cer.*, p. 40.

<sup>44</sup> The jewels in the *Elene* may be simply a device for expressing the radiance of the cross, just as the Anglo-Saxons often compared the sun and stars to jewels. A liturgical echo in an Anglo-Saxon line gives us: "þu scinende rod swiþor þonne tungle" (Aelfric, EETS, XCIV, p. 150; l. 117). "O crux splendidior cunctis astris," appears among other places in the *York Brev.*, II, col. 275.)

<sup>45</sup> This passage should be compared with *Riddle* 54, ll. 1 ff.

Ac he hlifode to heofontunglum,  
swilce he oferfæðmde foldan sceatas.

The “foldan sceatas” are the corners of the earth, to which the cross reaches as it spreads over the sky.<sup>46</sup> “Stodon” in the *Dream*, describing the position of the jewels, is fairly strong, possibly meaning something like “stood out.”<sup>47</sup> The whole passage I should then read as follows: “Gems stood out (on the cross) shining fair to the corners of the earth; five of these there were, above, on the shoulder-span.” The five, as we have seen, were very likely those of the Celtic cross, grouped in a quincunx at the junction of the beams.

Fracoðes gealga.

*DR*, I. 10.

Cook notes this expression as “a comparatively infrequent designation of the cross.”<sup>48</sup> But see *Crist and Satan*, ll. 511, 550; *Menologium*, l. 86; A. S. Hymns (Surtees Soc.), p. 78 (*Vexilla regis*), l. 4, “patibulo” glossed “gealgan”; F. E. Warren, *The Leofric Missal*, Oxford 1883, p. 141 (*crucis patibulum*); Dreves, ix, p. 27, 5b (*In ligno transverso sacri patibili*); Chevalier, *Poésie*

<sup>46</sup> Compare the symbolical interpretation in the gloss on the Trinity College MS. of the *Liber Hymnorum*, I, p. 39: “Si enim crux in terra proicitur per .iii. eius cornua, .iii. partes mundi demonstrat. In hoc voluit dominus demonstrare quod non uenit unam partem mundi redimere sed totum humanum genus.” Cf. Honorius, *Pat. Lat.*, CLXXIX, col. 593 (clx): “Quatuor cornua altaris signavit, dum quatuor partes mundi cruce salvavit”; *ibid.*, col. 946, “Crux si in terra inclinatur, ad orientem, meridiem, septentrionem, occidentem se protendere comprobatur, quia quatuor partes mundi ad regnum Christi signantur.”

<sup>47</sup> The same sense is expressed in the passage in the *Beowulf* (ll. 726-7):

“Him of eagum  
lige gelicost leoht stod unfæger.”

<sup>48</sup> *DR*, p. 16.

*Lit. du Moy. Age*, p. 176, lvi (152); Prudentius, p. 248, l. 641; *Benedictionale S. Æthelwold* (x cent., ms., *Archaeologia* xxiv, p. 108, "per beatae crucis patibulum.")

"Ne wæs þæt . . . fracoðes gealga" might be a reference to the cross of one of the thieves, which would naturally be in the mind of anyone in connection with the *Inventio Crucis*. But "fracoð" is not paralleled in the *Elene*; the two sinners are called "seaðena" in the A. S. prose (*EETS*, xlvi, p. 13), one of them "sceaþæ" in twelfth century prose (*EETS*, ciii, p. 32, l. 25; the gloss of *latro* in Wuelcker's *Vocabularies* is usually *sceaþa*, sometimes *þefe*; and the whole sentence may be simply a case of Anglo-Saxon understatement.

Syllic wæs se sigebeam.

*DR*, l. 13.

"Sigebeam" occurs several times in the *Elene*, as Cook has noted, but the kenning is familiar in the hymns and the liturgy. "Beam" is usually the gloss of *trabes*,<sup>49</sup> but the reference to the cross in this compound is so direct that we can hardly be arbitrary in considering it the equivalent of *lignum*. For the hymns we may note the following uses: *Mone*, i, p. 137 (Salve lignum trium-

<sup>49</sup> See Wuelcker, *Vocab.* In the sense of "timber" it might be a reference to the altar "beam" on which the crucifix hung and on which were images of the saints. See Gasquet, *Parish Life in Med. Eng.*, London, 1909, p. 51, and Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, iii, pp. 388 ff. But the reference to the cross is quite direct here, especially in the compound "sigebeam," and the cross conceived as a tree was a figure especially vivid to the people of the early period. For the latter it may be worth while noting the cross represented as a tree with the branches cut off, but still covered with greenish bark, in the stained glass of St. Etienne de Bourges, the St. Chapelle in Paris, and Notre Dame de Chartres. See Didron, *Christ. Icon.*, i, p. 412. See the green cross in the apse of St. Denis, *ibid.*, i, p. 416. See the cross of bright green, Twining, *Symbols and Emblems*, pl. xx, p. 42; and pl. vii, fig. 20. See also the altar cross in J. Tavenor-Perry, *Dinanderie*, p. 123; p. 118, pl. xiv.

phale); Daniel, v, 183, st. 3; Mone, I, p. 159, ll. 13 (triumphale lignum); Morel, *Lat. Hymnen*, p. 27, l. 85; Dreves, xxxi, p. 94, No. 74, st. 7 (O crux, lignum triumphale). For the kindred expression, sigebeacen, sigorbeacen, or sigores tacen, found only in the *Elene*,<sup>50</sup> note the following: Daniel, v, p. 183 (Ave, triumphale signum); Dreves, ix, p. 26, No. 25, 1a (Signum Christi triumphale); xxxix, p. 21, No. 9, 4a (signum triumphale). Compare Prudentius, p. 38, l. 83 (Dic tropeum passionis, dic triumphalem crucem); Mone, I, p. 142, ll. 35 (signum victoriae); *York Missal*, Surtees Soc., II, p. 103 (signum triumphale). Cook, *DR*, p. 16 (also *Crist*, notes, p. 192) takes the Anglo-Saxon expressions as referring to "the victorious sign seen by Constantine," but the use in the hymns shows that unnecessary.

Geseah ic wuldres treow  
wælum geweorðod      wynnum scinan. *DR*, ll. 14-15.

Cook (p. 17) compares the *Elene* ll. 88-90, which I have already quoted. Here we may note especially the phrase "wlitig wuldres treo" ("geseah ic" in *DR* I have dealt with in the other connection). Both passages, however, may profitably be compared with one in the *Vexilla regis* with its Anglo-Saxon translation:

|                         |                                                |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Arbor decora et fulgida | treow wlitig <i>ond</i> scinende               |
| Ornata regis purpura.   | gefrætewod cynges mid godewebbe. <sup>51</sup> |

*Purpura* is regularly glossed "godewebb" (see Napier, *O. E. Glosses*) which means a purple cloth or any rich material.<sup>52</sup> "Wædum" may hold some reminiscence of this expression. Certainly it has nothing to do with the *vexillum*, which is glossed "guþfana," and which, it is

<sup>50</sup> See Cook, *DR*, p. 16, n. 13.      <sup>51</sup> *A.-S. Hymns*, p. 78.

<sup>52</sup> See *Exodus*, ll. 588 and elsewhere.

interesting to note, did not appear in the Sarum and York use.<sup>53</sup> The suggestion offered by Stevens (p. 74) that “wædum” “may be a recollection of the veiling of the rood on Good Friday,” although it receives some support from line 22, is rendered doubtful by the context here, which has entirely to do with “wynnum,” “golde,” and “gimmas.” On the other hand, line 22 may be read with the meaning “purpura” for “wædum” and it does not lose in clearness or significance thereby.

Geseah ic þæt fuse beacen  
wendan wædum and bleom: hwilum hit wæs mid wætan bestemed,  
besyled mid swates gange, hwilum mid since gegyrwed.

*DR*, ll. 21-23.

We have here what seems one of the clearest allusions to the liturgy, to the method of changing the style of the cross between Lent and Easter. Ebert has noted certain foreign cases of using the blood-red cross<sup>54</sup> and asserts without evidence that the custom held among the Anglo-Saxons of the eighth century.<sup>55</sup> He gives this point in another connection and does not deal with “wendan wædum and bleom.” Rock, however, has shown the use of the red cross during Lent in England;<sup>56</sup> in the north the use was apparently general,<sup>57</sup> and this may be reflected

<sup>53</sup> *Tracts of Clement Maydeston*, HBS, p. 53.

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 84. See for various red crosses, Zoeckler, *Das Kreuz Christi*, Gütersloh, 1875, p. 238.

<sup>55</sup> The reference in the *Crist* (Part III), l. 1101, taken by itself, might easily be explained by the possibility that the cross was gold, and that since gold is often referred to as “red” and the color would be especially appropriate, it was so described. See *Genesis*, l. 2404.

<sup>56</sup> *Church of Our Fathers*, IV, p. 263. See also Gasquet, *Parish Life in Med. Eng.*, p. 171.

<sup>57</sup> *Tracts of Clement Maydeston*, HBS, p. 49: “Excepta prima dominica differatur crux lignea rubei coloris depicta sine ymagine crucifixi.” Stevens refers for evidence to the red crosses in *Archaeol.*, XLVIII, p. 456, but these are consecration crosses and without significance here.

in the Anglo-Saxon “mid wætan bestemed” and part of the reference in “bleom.”

This should be supplemented further by the possibility that there is some borrowing from the hymns in the very vividness of the detail in the *Dream*: Mone, I, p. 143, No. 109 (O crux, arbor inclita, Cristi membris praedita et sacrata sanguine); Chevalier, *Poésie Lit.*, p. 181, LXV, 174 (Beata crux cum gloria, Celso sacrata sanguine); Mone, I, p. 142, 43 (crux cruore consecrata); Dreves, XIV, p. 82, No. 72; XXXIX, No. 9, p. 21 (crucem tuo sanguine consecratam colimus); LI, p. 86, No. 81, st. 4; Daniel V, p. 184, st. 3; Merrill, *Lat. Hymns*, p. 67; Daniel, II, p. 101, No. 62; Merrill, p. 19, Pange lingua (Quem sacer cruar perunxit, fusas agni corpore); cf. Anselm, *Pat. Lat.* CLVIII, col. 937, Orat. XLII (Ave crux . . . ejus pretiosissimo sanguine cruentata); Mone, I, p. 140, l. 3 (fulgens Christi sanguine); I, p. 125, No. 99, ll. 25-26 (Per sanguinem sacerimum, rigasti crucis postem); I, p. 186, ll. 30 (Vidit in ara sacram crucis ostiam, Sanguinis undam, laticem de latere, Sancto fluente); Daniel IV, p. 322 (Crux alma . . . torrente Christi sanguinis ebria); Mone I, p. 159, No. 122, ll. 31; Morel, *Lat. Hymn.*, p. 28, No. 45, l. 8; Dreves, IV, No. 46, p. 34; IX, p. 27, 3a (O altitudo atque profundum crucis purpuratae in Christi sanguine); IX, p. 28, No. 29, 1a (Rubens agni sanguine); XV, p. 46, No. 24 (Agni rubens sanguine); cf. *York Missal*, Surtees Soc., II, p. 102 (Fuit haec salutis ara Rubens Agni sanguine); Dreves, XLIII, p. 23, No. 32, st. 2 (Tu decora sic consiste, Lota sacro sanguine); Prudentius, p. 86 (Hinc cruaris fluxit unda, lymfa parte ex altera: Lymfa nempe dat lavaerum, tum corona ex sanguine est).

While such expressions as the above account for “mid wætan bestemed,” the change implied in the “hwilum . . . hwilum” clauses needs further explanation. As I

have said, the plain red cross was carried during Lent, but on Palm Sunday a more ornamental cross appeared, as the Tracts of Maydeston tell us (p. 50):

Post distributionem palmarum exeat processio cum cruce lignea. . . . Deinde lectio euangelio feretum cum reliquijs preparatum, in quo corpus Christi in pixide dependat obuiam venientem cum cruce argentea. . . . Statim vero visa cruce argentea recedat crux lignaea.

And on Easter day, as I have already had occasion to mention, the “crux de christallo” was used, which was borne until Ascension-tide (Maydeston, p. 53). With this progressive change in mind, we may better understand what the poet means when he says that he saw the cross change in garb and color, sometimes it was stained with the flowing of blood and sometimes adorned with treasure.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Rock studies the usage with some evidence not without importance for us, *Church of Our Fathers*, IV, pp. 290 ff., citing the description of the cross in the cathedral of York: “Una crux de rubeo jaspide ornata cum argento deaurato, cum petris infixis in pede ligneo depictingo. . . . Item una crux de christallo cum pulchro pede bene sculpta.” (See *Mon. Angl.*, VIII, p. 1204.) See in the ritual of Durham (Surtees Soc., CVII, 1903, p. 10 and p. 105) the processional crosses, one of silver and double gilt, and one of gold. Cf. Chalmers, *Divine Worship*, p. 282; and the prayer, App., p. xviii. Also the Osmund Register lists the ornaments in the hands of the treasurer of Sarum, 1214-1222 (Wordsworth, *Cer. and Proc. of the Catholic Church of Salisbury*, p. 34 n. and p. 169):

Crux una magna cooperta argento cum ligno crucis beati Petri.  
Crux una processionaria bene deaurata cum lapidibus multis.  
Crux una processionaria dominicis diebus cooperta argento.  
Crux una aurea cum ligno dominico, cum multis lapidibus, cum  
pede argenti et pomello.  
Crux una deaurata ex una parte cum ligno dominico cum pede  
argenti.

The ceremony may be reflected in *Riddle 56*, ll. 3-4:

Wrætlic wudutreow ond wunden gold,  
sinc searobunden, ond seolfres dæl.

See also Gasquet, *Parish Life in Med. Eng.*, pp. 172 ff.

Geseah ic þa Frean mancynnes  
 efstan elne mycle þæt he me wolde on gestigan.  
 Þær ic þa ne dorste ofer Dryhtnes word  
 bugan oððe berstan, þa ic bifian geseah  
 eorðan sceatas. (DR, ll. 33-37)  
 gestah he on gealgan heanne. (l. 40)

Bifode ic þa me se Beorn ymbclypte; ne dorste ic hwæðre bugan  
 to eorðan,  
 feallan to foldan sceatum, ac ic sceolde fæste standan.  
(ll. 42-43)

It is hard to believe that these passages have not something to do with the striking lines in the *Pange lingua* of Fortunatus:

Flecte ramos, arbor alta, tensa laxa viscera  
 Et rigor lentescat ille, quem dedit nativitas,  
 Ut superni membra regis miti tendas stipite,  
(ll. 24 ff.)

The cross explains why it was unable to bend. And the last line of the Latin seems to be echoed in the *Dream* by “Geseah ic weruda God þearle þenian” (ll. 51-52).<sup>59</sup> Another line from Fortunatus, “Sola digna tu fuisti ferre pretium saeculi,” although it was a generally popular sentiment,<sup>60</sup> seems to appear in the following:

Me þa geweorðode wuldres Ealdor  
 ofer holtwudu, heofonrices Weard,  
 swylce he his modor eac Marian sylfe  
 ælmihtig God for ealle men  
 geweorðode ofer eall wifa cynn, (DR, ll. 90-94)

<sup>59</sup> Cf. A.-S. *Hymns*, p. 78, “Tendens manus vestigia” glossed “aþenigende handa fot-swaþu.” Cook refers to *Ben. Off.*, p. 73: “Crist wæs on rode aþened.”

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Cook, *DR*, pp. 21, 41, referring to “arbor una nobilis”; also Brandl, *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.*, 1905, p. 721. The line quoted above seems to be more to the point. The *Pange lingua* is almost entirely incorporated in the antiphons for the adoration of the cross in Gregory’s *Liber Antiphonarius*, §§ 684-5, Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, LXXVIII. Cf. also Chalmers, *Divine Worship*, App., pp. xxix ff. See the same sentiment in the hymns: Chevalier, *Poës*.

The figure in ll. 34 and 40 is paralleled in *Crist and Satan* (ll. 549 ff.) and in the hymns: Chevalier, *Poés. Lit.*, p. 176, LVI, 152 (Cum ascendisset Dominus Super crucis patibulum); Prudentius, p. 248, ll. 641 (Crux illa nostra est, nos patibulum ascendumus); *Liber Hymnorum*, I, p. 85, l. 22. The figure of l. 42 is paralleled: Mone, I, p. 181, st. 7 (O virtus crucis mundus attrahis amplexando tuis hinc inde brachiis); Dreves, IX, p. 27, 5b:

transverso sacri patibuli  
docemur  
expansis manibus  
crucifixi  
dextros et sinistros  
amplecti.

The most interesting parallel of all, however, is found in the third reading for the feast of St. Andrew in the York Breviary (Surtees Soc., vol. II, col. 88, lectio iij):

Cum pervenisset beatus andreas ad locum ubi crux parata erat: videns eam a longe exclamabat voce magna dicens: salve crux: que in corpore Christi dedicata es: et ex membris ejus tanquam margaritis ornata,<sup>a</sup> p̄s. Omnes gentes, añ. Antequam te ascenderet dominus noster o beata crux: timorem terrenum habuisti: modo vero amorem celestem obtinens pro voto susciperis. p̄s. Exaudi deus deprecationem. añ. Amator tuus semper fui: et desideravi te amplecti. o bona crux. p̄s. Exaudi deus orationem.

The Italics are mine. The passage affords us another con-

*Lit.*, p. 181, LXV (174), 2 (Electa cunctis credulis); Daniel, V, p. 183 (Quod solum fuisti dignum sustinere Dominum); Dreves, VII, p. 105, No. 91, 8a (quae sola fuisti digna portare regem). In the liturgy: *York Brev.*, II, col. 275 (que sola fuisti digna portare talentum mundi); col. 551 (que digna fuit portare precium hujus seculi); *Brev. Sarum*, III, col. 274.

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Anselm, *Pat. Lat.*, CLVIII, col. 942: "Salva me, sancta crux, quae in corpore Christi dedicata es, et ex membrorum ejus compage tanquam margaritis ornata; quae practium nostrum portare digna fuisti et vitam aeternam nobis attulisti." Cf. with this *York Brev.*, II, col. 551 (que digna fuit portare precium hujus seculi).

nection with the northern liturgy and also one with the story of St. Andrew.

Gyredon me golde and seolfre.

*DR*, l. 77.

This line has been taken as a reference to the story of the *Inventio*. We may note, however, that "golde and seolfre" is not paralleled in the *Elene* (ll. 1023 ff.), where we have "golde and gimeynnum." In the Latin (*Acta Sanct.*, Holth., *Elene*, p. 40) we have gold and jewels with a silver box, and also in Eusebius (see Cook, *Crist*, notes, p. 190). But the Anglo-Saxon Prose, which may indicate the Irish original,<sup>62</sup> tells us: "bewyrcan het mid golde ⁊ mid seolfre ⁊ mid deorwurþum gimmelum."<sup>63</sup> At this point, then, the *Dream* is again closer to a possible common original than to the *Elene*.

Is me nu lifes hyht  
þæt ic þone sigebeam secan mote.

*DR*, ll. 126-7.

The Christian "hope" is common in hymns of the cross, although not exactly in these terms: Daniel, iv, p. 185 (Crux sancta . . . vera spes nostra), Mone, i, p. 145, *A. S. Hymns*, Surtees Soc., p. 156; Daniel i, p. 225, No. cxcvii, 2 (Spes et certa redemptio): Chevalier, *Repert.*

<sup>62</sup> Although the details are not in the Irish abridged version; see Schirmer, *Leabhr. Breac*, p. 46.

<sup>63</sup> *EETS*, xlvi, p. 15. Cf. Durandus, *Rationale*, p. 138 ro, "lapidibus et preciosis adornatam." It may not be out of place to note here, however, that the *Elene* seems to have a special predilection for jewels: the nails after the crucifixion are described as shining like jewels (ll. 1114 ff.), while the analogues give them as shining like gold (*ASNS*, cxxv, p. 87; *ZDPhil*, xxxvii, p. 18), and in the *Dream* (l. 46) at the time of the crucifixion they are "deorcan," (note the parallel here in the *Dream* to the *Crist*, Part III, ll. 1107-9.) For the *Elene* see also note 44 above. It should be added that "golde and seolfre" of *DR* may have reference merely to the ceremony described in the discussion of ll. 21 ff. above.

*Hymnolog.*, iv, p. 88, No. 36454 (Crux, ave, spes unica inventionis); No. 36462 (Crux sancta . . . spes nostra); Dreves, ix, p. 26, No. 25, 1a (spes et nostra gloria); No. 26, 2a (sanctae crucis, spes nostra); xv, p. 46, No. 24 (spes praeclara); xv, p. 47, No. 25 (spes mihi viventi); xxii, p. 22, No. 15 (spes unica); xlvi, p. 57, No. 58 (unica spes hominum). See also the liturgy: *York Brev.*, col. 552 (crux, ave, spes unica), also col. 270; *Hereford Brev.*, *HBS*, xl, ii, p. 159. See a late hymn, Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, Leipzig, 1864, i, p. 252, No. 428 (magna spes credentium). See Anselm, Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, clviii, col. 939 (Tu es enim spes mea).

Incidentally it may be worth noting in relation to these lines and to l. 138 that the *lignum vitae* figure is extremely common: Mone, i, p. 181, st. 6 (Crux vitae lignum, Vitam mundi portans); i, 174, l. 8; Dreves, ix, p. 26, No. 25, 1b (lignum vitae); xv, p. 46, No. 24 (arbor vitae); xxii, p. 22, No. 15 (arbor vitae); xxxi, p. 94, No. 74, st. 6 (lignum vitae); xxxiv, p. 28, No. 24 (arbor ave vitae); xxxix, No. 9, p. 21, 3b (vitale lignum); xl, p. 33, No. 14 (lignum vitae).

And ic wene me  
daga gehwylce hwænne me Dryhtnes rod,  
þe ic her on eorðan ær sceawode,  
of þysson lænan life gefetige,  
and me þonne gebringe þær is blis micel.

*DR*, ll. 135 ff.

Stevens cites these lines (p. 74) as indicating that the poet deifies the cross: "In endowing the cross with personality, the poet of the *Dream of the Rood* outstrips any other writer." While we may agree with this comment in part (although we have noted how the poet borrows details and utilizes allusions), the opinion should be modified by observing the frequency of the figure in the hymns: compare Mone, i, p. 181, st. 7:

O excelsa crux,  
 ima perforans,  
 vinctos, quos absolvis,  
 ad summa erigis.

Also: Mone, I, p. 140, ll. 53; I, p. 142, ll. 43 (Per te nobis . . . sempiterna gaudia det superna gratia); Daniel, V, p. 183, st. 3 (Tu nos hinc per modum scalae Ducas ad coelestia); V, p. 304, No. 608, ll. 3 (Qui fidelis introducis Ad coelestem Patriam), l. 8 (Nos transfer ad gloriam); Dreves, XV, p. 47, No. 25 (In te confisum me ducas ad paradisum—addressed to Christ). See Anselm, *Pat. Lat.*, CLVIII, col. 942 (et vitam aeternam nobis attulisti); Greg. *Sac.*, *HBS*, p. 275 (per crucis lignum ad paradisum gaudia redeamus). See also the “lignum vitae” figure discussed above, especially Mone, I, p. 145, also in A. S. *Hymns*, Surtees Soc., p. 156; and cf. *DR*, l. 148 with A. S. *Hymns*, p. 83 (Redempta plebs captivata Reddita vitæ praemio).

Most of the conclusions given in the foregoing discussion need not be repeated. Many of them are extremely tentative, hardly more than shadowing as they do possible influence, and not attempting to arrive at the actual source. But to draw the matter together we may note the following points which seem to have received general support in the investigation: in the *Dream of the Rood* there are several clear allusions to the liturgy; even the phrases at times seem to be borrowed, especially from the hymn *Pange lingua*; we have observed several parallels in the *Dream* to Part Three of the *Crist*;<sup>64</sup> if there is any connection between the *Dream* and the *Inventio*, it exists between the

<sup>64</sup> Cook has noted many of the parallels. See note 63 above and Cook, *DR*, p. 30; *DR*, ll. 110, 117, and *Crist*, ll. 999, 1376 ff., and Cook, *DR*, p. 42. Others have been mentioned in the course of the study.

former and some document approximating the source of the *Elene* rather than the *Elene* itself. If the results of our search for liturgical influence are surprisingly small, the study has served to show all the more how little the poet of the *Dream* has relied on the conventional material accessible to him and yet with what effectiveness he has brought in reflections of the ecclesiastical services which he knew.

HOWARD R. PATCH.